

Date: Sat, 4 Jun 94 04:30:07 PDT
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V94 #622
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Sat, 4 Jun 94 Volume 94 : Issue 622

Today's Topics:

IPS Daily Report - 03 June 94
Legal Protections for Hams
Ten Tec Omni VI
TenTec Omni VI anyone?

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Fri, 3 Jun 1994 23:31:38 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!EU.net!sunic!trane.uninett.no!
ifi.uio.no!wabbit.cc.uow.edu.au!metro!ipso!rwc@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: IPS Daily Report - 03 June 94
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

SUBJ: IPS DAILY SOLAR AND GEOPHYSICAL REPORT
ISSUED AT 3/2330Z JUNE 1994 BY IPS RADIO AND SPACE SERVICES
FROM THE REGIONAL WARNING CENTRE (RWC), SYDNEY.
SUMMARY FOR 3 JUNE AND FORECAST UP TO 6 JUNE

IPS Warning 15 was issued on 26 May and is still current.

1A. SOLAR SUMMARY
Activity: very low.

Flares: none.

Observed 10.7 cm flux/Equivalent Sunspot Number : 68/02

1B. SOLAR FORECAST

	04 June	05 June	06 June
Activity	Very low	Very low	Very low
Fadeouts	None expected	None expected	None expected

Forecast 10.7 cm flux/Equivalent Sunspot Number : 70/05

1C. SOLAR COMMENT

None.

2A. MAGNETIC SUMMARY

Geomagnetic field at Learmonth: unsettled to active

Estimated Indices :	A	K	Observed A Index 2 June
Learmonth	19	3334 4343	
Fredericksburg	15		21
Planetary	20		19

Observed Kp for 2 June: 4444 3333

2B. MAGNETIC FORECAST

DATE	Ap	CONDITIONS
04 Jun	20	Unsettled to active.
05 Jun	20	Unsettled to active.
06 Jun	20	Unsettled to active.

2C. MAGNETIC COMMENT

Disturbance expected until 7 June due to a coronal hole. Activity is not expected to exceed active levels locally for the remainder of the disturbance period.

3A. GLOBAL HF PROPAGATION SUMMARY

	LATITUDE BAND		
DATE	LOW	MIDDLE	HIGH
03 Jun	normal	fair-normal	fair

PCA Event : None.

3B. GLOBAL HF PROPAGATION FORECAST

	LATITUDE BAND		
DATE	LOW	MIDDLE	HIGH
04 Jun	normal	normal	fair
05 Jun	normal	normal	fair
06 Jun	normal	normal	fair

3C. GLOBAL HF PROPAGATION COMMENT

Global HF propagation conditions are expected to improve slightly for the remainder of the geomagnetic disturbance currently in progress.

4A. AUSTRALIAN REGION IONOSPHERIC SUMMARY
MUFs at Sydney were near predicted monthly values

Observed T index for 03 June: 31

Predicted Monthly T Index for June is 30.

4B. AUSTRALIAN REGION IONOSPHERIC FORECAST

DATE	T-index	MUFs
04 Jun	25	Near predicted monthly values.
05 Jun	25	Near predicted monthly values.
06 Jun	25	Near predicted monthly values.

4C. AUSTRALIAN REGION COMMENT

Local propagation conditions remained normal-fair yesterday, with occasional sporadic E layer. Normal conditions are expected for the next three days.

--
IPS Regional Warning Centre, Sydney |IPS Radio and Space Services
email: rwc@ips.oz.au fax: +61 2 4148331 |PO Box 5606
RWC Duty Forecaster tel: +61 2 4148329 |West Chatswood NSW 2057
Recorded Message tel: +61 2 4148330 |AUSTRALIA

Date: 3 Jun 1994 23:27:21 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!darkstar.UCSC.EDU!news.hal.COM!olivea!ncd.com!
newshost.ncd.com!sheridan.ncd.com!steve@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Legal Protections for Hams
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <Cqtq3s.Fu1@ss3.magec.com>, pegood@ss3.magec.com (Peter E. Goodman) writes:

|> -How about protection from lawsuits related to TVI, telephone interference,
|> and other forms of RFI caused by poorly designed consumer products and/or
|> Part 15 devices operating on frequencies assigned to the Amateur service?

I see a couple of problems with the above.

First, consider that the state doesn't have any authority in the areas of TVI, RFI, or the design quality of consumer goods. The original poster is running for a STATE legislature. (FCC has authority for all of the above, and has claimed such will through federal preemption of same.)

The second problem I see with the statement Pete made is the assumption that these consumer goods are "poorly designed." Such goods are designed to meet specific standards put in place by FCC, et al. Part of what I use as a working description of a good design is whether the product does the required job for the cheapest manufacturing cost. From this point of view, designing in protective circuitry to eliminate interference from an amateur radio station as an example, isn't required, would make the product cost higher, and therefore, doesn't meet the metric I mentioned!

This isn't to say that I wouldn't like to see such protective circuitry in consumer electronics. The reality of being a designer in the consumer world is that these protections AREN'T required, and consequently aren't there. The place to go bang on is either Congress, or the FCC who DOES have the authority to mandate such design practices. You simply aren't going to see them there until it is mandatory. I guess my main points are that the original poster isn't in a place to help, and the designers aren't the ones to blame.

Lastly, part 15 devices are allowed to run on Amateur service frequencies due to FCC policy. Again, this is the place where any corrections are going to start, though I doubt such will ever occur. ARRL DID comment about possible interference when the new part 15 rules were adopted. Their comments fell on deaf ears.

|> On a VERRRRRRY loosely related subject, how about eliminating the
|> "industrial exemption" clause in your state's engineering registration law?
|> These exemptions, which most if not all states have, allow unlicensed
|> "engineers (who may not even have any engineering education or experience)
|> to practice as engineers as long as they only design manufactured goods. Would
|> you allow an unlicensed physician, who can only kill one person at a time to
|> practice medicine? How about an unlicensed automotive "engineer" who could
|> kill many people with a single mistake?

|>

|> Thanks, and good luck!!

|>

|>

73,

|>

Pete Goodman, P.E., NI9N

|>

|>

Responding to the above is the REAL reason I'm posting! Pete, as soon as a PE license has RELEVANT material, i.e. tests me on items that are relevant to design field I'm in, then I'll consider going and getting a PE. Currently, the PE is an absolutely USELESS piece of paper for me and at the same time has NO bearing on the field I'm in. If I were designing bridges or buildings this wouldn't be true, but the current test structure in CA doesn't come close to being relevant to computer design! For instance, there just isn't that much need to apply fluid flow theory to designing a new PC. I need to know about computer architecture, computer languages, functionality available in current

logic families, compatibility between logic families, EMI, RFI considerations, etc. Most of the above ISN'T covered on the PE last time I looked. The fact is that they would ask me things that I forgot soon after I graduated that have no bearing on what I see as a practicing engineer in a commercial setting. Consequently, the test does NOTHING to insure that I am competent to practice in my particular specialty.

So, to answer your question...Would I want an unlicensed automotive "engineer" to design the vehicle I'm riding in... I suspect I already am ;-) So, I guess I wouldn't mind! Certainly, there have been vehicle recalls over the years due to design mistakes, but if memory serves, a lot of these were due to management decisions, not engineering decisions, i.e. the design flaw was discovered, but management swept the issue under the rug. Happens all the time. How would a "licensed" engineering staff have made a difference here?

Steve Wilson, KA6S - PE⁻⁻ ;-)

Date: Fri, 03 Jun 1994 14:00:10 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!
cass.ma02.bull.com!claudel!zds-oem!news@network.ucsd.edu (Reid Simmons -
r.simmons@zds.com)
Subject: Ten Tec Omni VI
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <2sg7ts\$d7c@search01.news.aol.com> jduffy@aol.com (JDuffy) writes:

>In article <espen.329.000CEB08@itekiris.kjemi.unit.no>,

>espen@itekiris.kjemi.unit.no (Espen Olsen) writes:

>

>

>>How is the Omni VI really? In some time we'll have to buy a new rig

>at LA1K

>>to replace the old IC751A. The Omni VI looks like a good rig out

>from the

>>ads/specs/etc...

>

>>Does anybody here actually operate one of these? How is it like?

>

>A friend of mine lent me his Omni while he went on a 2 week vacation.

> Boy is that rig fantastic. The audio was like nothing I have ever

>heard from a ham receiver. It was a beautiful and fun radio to use.

>Got nothing but great reports while using it. As soon as I get the

>money saved up, I'm ordering one. Also understand that TenTec's

>service can't be beat. I don't think you'll go wrong in buying it.

>Plus, it will help employ Americans instead of Japanese.

>

>Duffy de WB8NUT

I have had my OMNI VI for just about two years now. I ordered one when TEN TEC first announced it. In short it is without a doubt the best rig I have ever used in my 33 years of hamming (I never had any Collins stuff though). This includes a whole bunch of Rice boxes (Kenwood, Icom, Yahoos) that I couldn't wait to get rid of! My OMNI VI has made hamming fun again - something the rice boxes just couldn't accomplish.

Reid NZ8K

Date: Fri, 03 Jun 1994 13:57:55 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!cass.ma02.bull.com!claude!zds-oem!news@network.ucsd.edu (Reid Simmons - r.simmons@zds.com)
Subject: TenTec Omni VI anyone?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <2sg7ts\$d7c@search01.news.aol.com> jduffy@aol.com (JDuffy) writes:

>In article <espen.329.000CEB08@itekiris.kjemi.unit.no>,

>espen@itekiris.kjemi.unit.no (Eспен Olsen) writes:

>

>

>>How is the Omni VI really? In some time we'll have to buy a new rig

>at LA1K

>>to replace the old IC751A. The Omni VI looks like a good rig out

>from the

>>ads/specs/etc..

>

>>Does anybody here actually operate one of these? How is it like?

>

>A friend of mine lent me his Omni while he went on a 2 week vacation.

> Boy is that rig fantastic. The audio was like nothing I have ever

>heard from a ham receiver. It was a beautiful and fun radio to use.

>Got nothing but great reports while using it. As soon as I get the

>money saved up, I'm ordering one. Also understand that TenTec's

>service can't be beat. I don't think you'll go wrong in buying it.

>Plus, it will help employ Americans instead of Japanese.

>

>Duffy de WB8NUT

End of Info-Hams Digest V94 #622
